

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MAISA KURDI,

Plaintiff,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:22-cv-00729-JLT-EPG

ORDER DENYING, WITHOUT PREJUDICE,
PROPOSED STIPULATED PROTECTIVE
ORDER

(ECF No. 34)

This matter is before the Court on the parties' proposed stipulated protective order. (ECF No. 34). Upon review, the Court will deny, without prejudice, the request to enter the proposed order.

Among other things, the proposed order fails to address Local Rule 141(c), which sets out various requirements for a protective order. For example, the parties define confidential information to mean "information (regardless of how it is generated, stored or maintained) or tangible things that qualify for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)." (ECF No. 34, p. 2). But such a definition improperly allows the parties to deem information confidential so long as they themselves believe that it qualifies for protection without ever disclosing the types of information at issue contrary to Local Rule 141(c)(1), which requires as follows: "A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a troubled child)."

